Appeal: 16-1119 Doc: 36 Filed: 08/01/2016 Pg: 1 of 3

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-1119

SHERIF A. PHILIPS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

NORTH CAROLINA STATE; NORTH CAROLINA COURT SYSTEM; NORTH CAROLINA AGENCY; VIDANT MEDICAL CENTER, f/k/a Pitt County Memorial Hospital; M.D. PAUL BOLIN; RALPH WHATLEY; DAVID CREECH, Pitt County Memorial Hospital lawyer; JAY SALSMAN, Pitt County Memorial Hospital lawyer; DEBBIE MEYER, Law Firm, Cary, NC; KAREN ZANER, Law Firm, Dallas, TX; JAMES CROUSE, Law Firm, Raleigh, NC; NARDINE GUIRGUIS, Law Firm, Raleigh, NC,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Fox, Senior District Judge. (5:15-cv-00095-F)

Submitted: July 28, 2016 Decided: August 1, 2016

Before MOTZ and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Sherif Philips, Appellant Pro Se. Kathryn Hicks Shields, Assistant Attorney General, Raleigh, North Carolina; Walter Gregory Merritt, HARRIS, CREECH, WARD & BLACKERBY, New Bern, North Carolina; Joseph Lawrence Nelson, DICKIE, MCCAMEY & Appeal: 16-1119 Doc: 36 Filed: 08/01/2016 Pg: 2 of 3

CHILCOTE, Charlotte, North Carolina; John Thomas Crook, David Stebbins Coats, BAILEY & DIXON, Raleigh, North Carolina; Felix Hill Allen, IV, THARRINGTON SMITH LLP, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Appeal: 16-1119 Doc: 36 Filed: 08/01/2016 Pg: 3 of 3

## PER CURIAM:

Sherif Philips appeals the district court's order denying relief on his civil complaint. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Philips v. N.C. State, No 5:15-cv-0095-F (E.D.N.C. Dec. 28, 2015). We deny Philips' motions to appoint counsel and for consideration of recusal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED